-27-

TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

OCTOBER TERM, [redacted] 1918

No. [redacted] 367

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF IN ERROR,

vs.

C. T. DOREMUS.

IN ERROR TO THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS.

FILED FEBRUARY 19, 1918.

(26344)

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

OCTOBER TERM, 1917.

No. 877.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF IN ERROR,

vs.

C. T. DOREMUS.

IN ERROR TO THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS.

INDEX.

	Original.	Print.
Caption		1
Indictment	2	1
Motion to quash the indictment	9	7
Order of court sustaining demurrer of defendant and dismissing indictment	11	8
Opinion, West, J.	12	9
Assignment of error	22	16
Petition for writ of error	23	17
Writ of error	24	17
Citation in error	25	18
Præcipe for transcript	26	19
Certificate of clerk	27	19

1 *Caption.*

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Western District of Texas,
San Antonio Division.

Be it remembered that at a term of the United States District Court in and for the Western District of Texas the Honorable Du Val West, United States District Judge, presiding, and holding its sessions at San Antonio, Texas, and which term began on the 17th day of December, A. D. 1917, and continued in session to and including the 7th day of February, A. D. 1918, there came on to be heard and determined, amongst other cause pending on the docket, the following causes:

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
vs.
C. T. DOREMUS. } No. 2254. Criminal.

2 THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

In the honorable United States District Court for the Western District of Texas, sitting at and in the city of San Antonio, within said district, at its December term, A. D. 1916.

In the name and by the authority of the United States of America comes our Grand Jury of the United States of America and the Western District of Texas, and the San Antonio Division thereof, and being first duly selected, tried, empanelled, sworn, and charged upon their oaths in open court, do present:

First Count.

That heretofore, to wit, on or about the 11th day of March, A. D. 1915, at the city of San Antonio, Western District of Texas, and the San Antonio Division thereof, one C. T. Doremus, a physician, who had duly registered and who had paid the special tax as required by the act of Congress approved December 17, 1914, entitled, "An act to provide for the registration of, with the collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or cocoa leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes," did unlawfully, fraudulently, and knowingly sell and give away and distribute to one Alexander Ameris, alias Alexander Myers, a certain quantity of heroin, to wit, five hundred (500) one-sixth grain tablets of heroin, a derivative of opium, which said sale was not made in pursuance of a written order of the said Alexander Ameris, alias Alexander Myers, to the said C. T. Doremus on a form issued in blank for that purpose by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States, as required by the act of Congress of December 17, 1914, aforesaid.

Second count.

And the Grand Jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths as aforesaid, do further present:

That herefore, to wit, on or about the 11th day of March, A. D. 1915, at the city of San Antonio, Western District of Texas, and the San Antonio Division thereof, one C. T. Doremus, who was then and there a physician duly registered and who had paid the special tax under the provisions of the act of Congress approved De-
3 cember 17, 1914, and entitled "An act to provide for the registration of with the collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or cocoa leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes," did unlawfully, knowingly, and willfully sell, dispense, and distribute to one Alexander Ameris, alias Alexander Myers, five hundred (500) one-sixth grain tablets of heroin, a derivative of opium, not in the regular course of the professional practice of the said C. T. Doremus, and not for the treatment of any disease from which the said Alexander Ameris, alias Alexander Myers, was then and there suffering, but as was then and there well known to the said Doremus, the said Alexander Ameris, alias Alexander Myers, was then and there a person addicted to the use of the drug aforesaid as a habit, being a person popularly known as a "dope fiend," and the said C. T. Doremus did sell, dispense, and distribute the drug aforesaid to the said Alexander Ameris, alias Alexander Myers, for the purpose of gratifying his appetite for the said drug as a habitual user of the same.

Third count.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths as aforesaid, do further present:

That here'fore, to wit, on or about the 19th day of March, 1915, at the city of San Antonio, Western District of Texas, and the San Antonio division thereof, one C. T. Doremus, a physician, who had duly registered and who had paid the special tax as required by the act of Congress approved December 17, 1914, entitled "An act to provide for the registration of, with the collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or cocoa leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes," did unlawfully, fraudulently, and knowingly sell and give away and distribute to one Alexander Ameris, alias Alexander Myers, a certain quantity of heroin, to wit: Five hundred (500) one-sixth grain tablets of heroin, a derivative of opium, which said sale was not made in pursuance of a written order of the said Alexander Ameris, alias Alexander Myers,
4 to the said C. T. Doremus on a form issued in blank for that purpose by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the

United States, as required by the act of Congress of December 17, 1914, aforesaid.

Fourth count.

And your grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths as aforesaid, do further present:

That here'fore, to wit, on or about the 26th day of March, A. D. 1915, at the city of San Antonio, Western District of Texas, and the San Antonio division thereof, one C. T. Doremus, a physician, who had duly registered and who had paid the special tax as required by the act of Congress approved December 17, 1914, "An act to provide for the registration of, with the collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium, or cocoa leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes," did unlawfully, fraudulently, and knowingly sell and give away and distribute to one Alexander Ameris, alias Alexander Myers, a certain quantity of heroin, to wit, five hundred (500) one-sixth grain tablets of heroin, a derivative of opium, which said sale was not made in pursuance of a written order of the said Alexander Ameris, alias Alexander Myers, to the said C. T. Doremus on a form issued in blank for that purpose by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States of America, as required by the act of Congress of December 17, 1914, aforesaid.

Fifth count.

And your grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths as aforesaid, do further present:

That here'fore, to wit, on or about the 31st day of October, A. D. 1916, at the city of San Antonio, Western District of Texas, and the San Antonio division thereof, one C. T. Doremus, a physician, who had duly registered and who had paid the special tax as required by the act of Congress approved December 17, 1914, and entitled "An act to provide for the registration of, with the collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or cocoa leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes," did unlawfully, fraudulently, and knowingly, sell and give away and distribute to one Frank Halamoody, alias Frank Moody, twenty-five (25) one-half grains tablets of morphine, a derivative of opium, which said sale was not made in pursuance of a written order of the said Frank Halamoody to the said C. T. Doremus on a form issued in blank for that purpose by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States of America, as required by the act of Congress of December 17, 1914, aforesaid.

Sixth count.

And your grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths as aforesaid, do further present:

That here'fore, to wit, on or about the 31st day of October, A. D. 1916, at the city of San Antonio, Western District of Texas, and the San Antonio Division thereof, one C. T. Doremus, who was then and there a physician duly registered and who had paid the special tax under the provisions of the act of Congress approved December 17, 1914, and entitled "An act to provide for the registration of, with the collectors of the internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium, or cocoa leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes," did unlawfully, knowingly, and willfully sell, dispense, and distribute to one Frank Halamoody, alias Frank Moody, twenty-five (25) one-half grain tablets of morphine, a derivative of opium, not in the regular course of the professional practice of the said C. T. Doremus, and not for the treatment of any disease from which the said Frank Halamoody, alias Frank Moody, was then and there suffering, but as was then and there well known to the said Doremus, the said Frank Halamoody, alias Frank Moody, was then and there a person addicted to the use of the drug aforesaid as a habit, being a person popularly known as a "dope fiend," and the said C. T. Doremus did sell, dispense, and distribute the drug, aforesaid, to the said Frank Halamoody, alias Frank Moody, for the pur-
6 pose of gratifying his appetite for said drug as a habitual user of the same.

Seventh count.

And your grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths as aforesaid, do further present:

That heretofore, to wit, on or about the 31st day of October, A. D. 1916, at the city of San Antonio, in the Western District of Texas, and the San Antonio Division thereof, one C. T. Doremus, a physician, who had duly registered and who had paid the special tax as required by the act of Congress approved December 17, 1914, entitled "An act to provide for the registration of, with the collectors of the internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or cocoa leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes," did unlawfully, fraudulently, and knowingly sell and give away and distribute to one Tom Walsh twenty-five (25) one-half grain tablets of morphine, a derivative of opium, which said sale was not made in pursuance of a written order of the said Tom Walsh to the said C. T. Doremus on a form issued in blank for that purpose by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States, as required by the act of Congress of December 17, 1914, aforesaid.

Eighth count.

And your grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths as aforesaid, do further present:

That here'fore, to wit, on or about the 31st day of October, A. D. 1916, at the city of San Antonio, in the Western District of Texas, and the San Antonio Division thereof, one C. T. Doremus, who was then and there a physician duly registered and who had paid the special tax under the provisions of the act of Congress approved December 17, 1914, and entitled "An act to provide for the registration of, with the collectors of the internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or cocoa leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes," did unlawfully, knowingly, and willfully sell, dis-
7 pense, and distribute to one Tom Walsh twenty-five (25) one-half grain tablets of morphine, a derivative of opium, not in the regular course of the professional practice of the said C. T. Doremus, and not for the treatment of any disease from which the said Tom Walsh was then and there suffering, but as was then and there well known to the said Doremus, the said Tom Walsh was then and there a person addicted to the use of the drug aforesaid as a habit, being a person popularly known as a "dope fiend," and the said C. T. Doremus did sell, dispense, and distribute the drug, aforesaid, to the said Tom Walsh for the purpose of gratifying his appetite for said drug as a habitual user of the same.

Ninth count.

And your grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths as aforesaid, do further present:

That heretofore, to wit, on or about the 20th day of November, A. D. 1916, at the city of San Antonio, in the Western District of Texas, and the San Antonio Division thereof, one C. T. Doremus, a physician, who had duly registered and who had paid the special tax as required by the act of Congress approved December 17, 1914, entitled "An act to provide for the registration of, with the collectors of the internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or cocoa leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes," did unlawfully, fraudulently, and knowingly sell and give away and distribute to one May Moore twenty-five (25) one-half grain tablets of morphine, a derivative of opium, which said sale was not made in pursuance of a written order of the said May Moore to the said C. T. Doremus on a form issued in blank for that purpose by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States of America, as required by the act of Congress of December 17, 1914, aforesaid.

Tenth count.

And your grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths as aforesaid, do further present:

That heretofore, to wit, on or about the 20th day of November, A. D. 1916, at the city of San Antonio, in the Western District of Texas, and the San Antonio Division thereof, one C. T. Doremus, who was then and there a physician duly registered and who had paid the special tax under the provisions of the act of Congress approved December 17, 1914, and entitled "An act to provide for the registration of, with the collectors of the internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or cocoa leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes," did unlawfully, knowingly, and wilfully sell, dispense, and distribute to one May Moore twenty-five (25) one-half grain tablets of morphine, a derivative of opium not in the regular course of the professional practice of the said C. T. Doremus, and not for the treatment of any disease from which the said May Moore was then and there suffering, but as was then and there well known to the said Doremus, the said May Moore was then and there a person addicted to the use of the drug aforesaid, as a habit, being a person popularly known as a "dope fiend," and the said C. T. Doremus did sell, dispense, and distribute the drug aforesaid to the said May Moore for the purpose of gratifying her appetite for the said drug as a habitual user of the same.

8

Contrary to the form of the statute in such cases made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

[SEAL.] (Signed) F. M. FLY,
Foreman of the Grand Jury.

(Endorsed:) No. 2254. Criminal. The United States of America vs. C. T. Doremus. In the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas, at San Antonio. Indictment. Charge: Unlawfully dealing in narcotics in violation of act of December 17, 1914. Witnesses: Alexander Ameris, San Antonio; Frank Halamoody, San Antonio; Tom Walsh, San Antonio; May Moore, San Antonio; C. A. Wood, San Antonio; W. S. Wood, San Antonio. A true bill, F. M. Fly, foreman of grand jury. J. L. Camp, U. S. dist. attorney. Hugh R. Robertson, asst. U. S. dist. attorney. Filed January 19, 1917, D. H. Hart, clerk.

9 The United States of America, Western District of Texas, San Antonio Division.

Indictment for unlawfully dealing in narcotics.

THE UNITED STATES, vs. C. T. DOREMUS. } No. 2254.

Now comes the defendant, C. T. Doremus, and moves the court to quash all and every count of the indictment herein presented against him for the following reasons, to wit:

1st. The pretended law upon which this indictment is based is void because the Congress of the United States had not, and has not, the power to pass the act of December 17, 1914, except such portions thereof as provide for fixing and collecting a tax, and except such portions as forbid interstate shipments of the drugs mentioned in the said act; and the overt acts charged against the defendant, if true, would not, and did not, in any way defeat, prevent, hinder, or delay the collection of the special tax required to be paid.

(a) Because, when a person has paid the tax and registered as required by law, his right to dispose of the enumerated drugs can not be prohibited by the Congress, unless such disposition may or does or tends to prevent, hinder, or delay the collection of the revenue.

(b) Because said act of Congress, except so far as it provides for the payment of a special tax, and the register of the names of the parties paying the tax, and except so far as it regulates interstate commerce in the named drugs, is purely a police measure, upon which the Congress is without power to act.

2nd. And the defendant further moves the court to strike from the charging clauses of counts 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 9 of the indictment, the word "distribute," because the act of Congress upon which this indictment is based, prohibits only the sale, barter, exchange, and giving away, of the drugs named therein, and does not make the distribution of the same an offense.

3rd. The defendant further moves the court to strike from the charging clauses of counts 2, 6, 8, and 10 of the indictment, the words "dispense and distribute," because the pretended law upon which this indictment is based, prohibits only the sale, barter, exchange, and giving away of the drugs mentioned in said counts, and does not make it an offense to "dispense" and "distribute" said drugs.

10 4th. The defendant further moves the court to strike from the charging clauses of counts 2, 6, 8, and 10 of the indictment, the word "regular" immediately preceding the words "course of the professional practice of the said C. T. Doremus," because the law does not require a dispensing or distribution by a physician to be in the regular course of his professional practice.

5th. The defendant further moves the court to strike from the charging clauses of counts 2, 6, 8, and 10, of the indictment all those parts thereof, commencing with the words "and not for the treatment of any disease," and ending with the words, "for the purpose of gratifying his (her) appetite for said drug as an habitual user of the same," because a mere sale, or dispensing, or distribution of the drugs mentioned in said counts to a "dope fiend," is not an offense against the revenue laws of the United States, and because the law does not forbid the sale, dispensing, or distribution of the named drugs to a "dope fiend" for the purpose of gratifying the appetite of such "dope fiend."

6th. The defendant further moves the court to strike out in counts 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 9, of said indictment, the words, "and give away and distribute," because the illegality of the giving away and distribution is not shown; and there is no averment that the "giving away" or "distribution" was not made in pursuance of a written order, etc.," therefore the illegality of these two acts are not shown, nor is the legality of the acts negatived.

And upon the above and foregoing motions the defendant prays judgment of the court, and that he go hence without day.

HALTOM & HALTOM,
Attorneys for Defendant.

(Endorsed:) No. 2254. The United States vs. C. T. Doremus. Motion to quash the indictment. Filed May 17, 1917. D. H. Hart, clerk, by A. I. Campbell, deputy.

11 United States District Court, Western District of Texas, San Antonio Division.

Order sustaining demurrer and dismissing indictment, January 2, 1917.

THE UNITED STATES
vs.
CHARLES T. DOREMUS. } No. 2254.

On this, the 2nd day of January, A. D. 1917, came on for final hearing and determination the defendant's demurrer or motion to quash the indictment in this cause, for the reasons and upon the grounds specifically set out in said demurrer or motion; and the same having been heard, together with the argument of counsel thereon, and the court, having duly considered same, is of opinion that said demurrer or motion to quash should be sustained, and it is accordingly—

Ordered by the court that defendant's demurrer or motion to quash the indictment in this cause be, and the same is hereby, sustained and the indictment dismissed; to which ruling and order of the court the United States, by their district attorney, then and there in open court excepted.

12 United States v. Charles T. Doremus.

No. 2254.

United States District Court for the Western District of Texas, San Antonio Division.

Indictment charging unlawful dealing in narcotics; violation of act of December 17th, 1914.

Hearing on demurrer to indictment, styled "motion to quash."

HUGH R. ROBERTSON, Assistant U. S. District Attorney, of San Antonio, Texas, for the United States.

HALTOM & HALTOM, of San Antonio, Texas, for the defendant.

Omitting formal parts, the first and second counts of the indictment are substantially as follows:

First count: "That heretofore, to wit, on or about the 11th day of March, A. D. 1915, at the city of San Antonio, Western District of Texas, and the San Antonio Division thereof, one C. T. Doremus, a physician, who had duly registered and who had paid the special tax as required by the act of Congress approved December 17, 1914, entitled 'An act to provide for the registration of, with the collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium of coca leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes,' did unlawfully, fraudulently, and knowingly sell and give away and distribute to one Alexander Ameris, alias Alexander Myers, a certain quantity of heroin, to wit, five hundred (500) one-sixth grain tablets of heroin, a derivative of opium, which said sale was not made in pursuance of a written order of the said Alexander Ameris, alias Alexander Myers, to the said C. T. Doremus on a form issued in blank for that purpose by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States, as required by the act of Congress of December 17, 1914, aforesaid."

Second count: This count is identical with the first count, except that the offense charged is that defendant "did unlawfully, knowingly, and wilfully sell, dispense, and distribute to one Alexander Ameris, alias Alexander Myers, five hundred (500) one-sixth grain tablets of heroin, a derivative of opium, not in the regular course of the professional practice of the said C. T. Doremus, and not for the treatment of any disease from which the said Alexander Ameris, alias Alexander Myers, was then and there suffering, but as was then and there well known to the said Doremus, the said Alexander Ameris, alias Alexander Myers, was then and there a person addicted to the use of the drug aforesaid as a habit, being a person popularly known as a 'dope fiend,' and the said C. T. Doremus did sell, dispense, and distribute the drug aforesaid to the said Alexander Ameris, alias Alexander Myers, for the purpose of gratifying his appetite for said drug as a habitual user of the same."

13 These counts are followed by eight others, identical with the first and second counts, except as to dates, names of parties to whom the drug was dispensed, different quantities, etc., it being necessary, in passing upon the motion, to consider only the first and second counts.

The first count charges a violation of the first sentence of section 2 of the act, in a sale by defendant of the prohibited drug as having been made without a written order from the purchaser to defendant seller. The second count charges a violation of paragraph (a) of the same section, in the sale, dispensing, and distribution by the defendant of the prohibited drug, "not in the regular course of his professional practice." Section 2, and paragraphs (a) and (b), are as follows:

"It shall be unlawful for any person to sell, barter, exchange, or give away any of the aforesaid drugs except in pursuance of a written order of the persons to whom such article is sold, bartered, exchanged, or given on a form to be issued in blank for that purpose by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Every person who shall accept any such order, and in pursuance thereof shall sell, barter, exchange, or give away any of the aforesaid drugs shall preserve such order for a period of two years in such a way as to be readily accessible to inspection by any officer, agent, or employee of the Treasury Department duly authorized for that purpose, and the State, Territorial, District, municipal, and insular officials named in section 5 of this act. Every person who shall give an order as herein provided to any other person for any of the aforesaid drugs shall, at or before the time of giving such order, make or cause to be made a duplicate thereof on a form to be issued in blank for that purpose by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and in case of the acceptance of such order shall preserve such duplicate for said period of two years in such a way as to be readily accessible to inspection by the officers, agents, employees, and officials hereinbefore mentioned. Nothing contained in this section shall apply—

"(a) To the dispensing or distribution of any of the aforesaid drugs to a patient by a physician, dentist, or veterinary surgeon registered under this act in the course of his professional practice only: *Provided*, That such physician, dentist, or veterinary surgeon shall keep a record of all such drugs dispensed or distributed to a patient upon whom such physician, dentist, or veterinary surgeon shall personally attend; and such record shall be kept for a period of two years from the date of dispensing or distributing such drugs, subject to inspection, as provided in this act.

"(b) To the sale, dispensing, or distribution of any of the aforesaid drugs by a dealer to a consumer under and in pursuance of a written prescription issued by a physician, dentist, or veterinary surgeon registered under this act: *Provided, however*, That such prescription shall be dated as of the day on which signed and shall be

signed by the physician, dentists, or veterinary surgeon who shall have issued the same: *And provided further*, That such dealer
14 shall preserve such prescription for aperiod of two years from the day on which such prescription is filled in such a way as to be readily accessible to inspection by the officers, agents, employees, and officials hereinbefore mentioned."

The first paragraph of the motion to quash, or demurrer, is as follows:

"The pretended law upon which this indictment is based is void because the Congress of the United States had not, and has not, the power to pass the act of December 17, 1914, except such portions thereof as provide for fixing and collecting a tax, and except such portions as forbid interstate shipments of the drugs mentioned in the said act; and the overt acts charged against the defendant, if true, would not, and did not, in any way defeat, prevent, hinder, or delay the collection of the special tax required to be paid.

"(a) Because, when a person has paid the tax and registered as required by law, his right to dispose of the enumerated drugs can not be prohibited by the Congress, unless such disposition may or does or tends to prevent, hinder, or delay the collection of the revenue.

"(b) Because said act of Congress, except so far as it provides for the payment of a special tax and the register of the names of the parties paying the tax, and except so far as it regulates interstate commerce in the named drugs, is purely a police measure, upon which the Congress is without power to act."

Only those grounds mentioned in the first paragraph will be considered.

The motion avers that the act is a revenue or taxing measure; that the act of omission charged as an offense in the first count, and the act committed, charged as an offense in the second count, if true, are merely violations of local police regulations which the Congress has no power to establish, the act to that extent being an invasion of the reserved power of local regulation inherent in the State governments, and in violation of the Constitution of the United States.

Amendment to the Constitution, Article X, provides: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

In construing this article, the Supreme Court of the United States in many cases has held that "the power of the States to regulate matters of internal police within their limits applies not only to the health, morals, and safety of the public, but also to whatever pro-
motes the public peace, comfort, and convenience." Boston
15 Railroad Co. v. Massachusetts, 97 U. S., 25. See also many authorities to the same effect cited in paragraph 10, Notes of Decisions, U. S. Compiled Statutes, Annotated, 1916, vol. 11, page 14419. This reserved police power retained in the States has reference to the practice of medicine, etc. See Meffert v. Packer et al., 195 U. S., 625.

The Government's counsel declares that the decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in the case of Thurston v. United States, 241 Fed. Rep., 335, is conclusive. The first and second counts of this indictment are identical in substance with the first count of the indictment in that case, there held to be sufficient. The indictment in the Thurston case charges a conspiracy to commit the same alleged offenses as are sought to be charged in the first and second counts here. An examination of that case discloses that the constitutional question involved there related to the right of search and seizure, and not to the reserved power of domestic regulation—the question here. The remaining question considered by the court in the Thurston case was whether an offense against the law was charged in the indictment. Upon that point the court merely remarked that the count fully informed the defendants of the charges they were brought to answer, and fully showed that it was sufficient to put the defendants on trial on the charge of conspiracy to violate the Harrison narcotic law. Whether or not the offenses there charged invaded the province of the State's reserved police power was not considered. The court, therefore, does not hold that the act is not an attempted exercise of the police power, as contended by the Government.

In the case of United States v. Jin Fuey Moy, 241 U. S., 394, the act is referred to by counsel for the Government in that case as one to which Congress gave the appearance of a taxing measure in order that it might have a coating of constitutionality, but that in reality it was a police measure that strained all the powers of the legislature, to which reference Mr. Justice Holmes adverted, stating: "It may be assumed that the statute has a moral end as well as a revenue end in view, but we are of opinion that the district court, in treating those ends as to be reached only through a revenue measure, and within the limits of a revenue measure, was right." See also, Lowe v. Farbwerke-Hoechst Co., 240 Fed. Rep., 671.

The act of August 2nd, 1886, known as the oleomargarine act, though a taxing and revenue act, and as such held constitutional (In re Kollock, 165 U. S., 526), had for its moral end the idea of protecting the public against sales of oleomargarine by unscrupulous dealers as butter. In that case Chief Justice Fuller expressed himself as follows:

"The act before us is on its face an act for levying taxes, and, although it may operate in so doing to prevent deception in the sale of oleomargarine as and for butter, its primary object must be assumed to be the raising of revenue. . . . The oleomargarine legislation does not differ in character from laws relating to distilled spirits and tobacco, and the object is the same in both, namely, to secure revenue by internal taxation, and to prevent fraud in the collection of such revenue. Protection to purchasers in respect of getting the real, and not a spurious, article can not be held to be the primary object in either instance, and the identification of dealer,

substance, quantity, etc., by marking and branding, must be regarded as means to effectuate the objects of the act in respect of revenue."

In Dougherty v. United States, 108 Fed. Rep., 56, where the oleomargarine act, section 6, was attacked as being a police regulation, and as such in violation of the Constitution, District Judge Bradford, referring to the Kollock case and confirming same, said: "The marking, stamping, and branding required by the regulations must therefore be regarded as 'means to effect the object of the act in respect of revenue.'"

In testing the constitutional question raised by the motion, the controlling factor, as declared by Justice Fuller, is whether or not the acts charged as offenses in the two counts are to be regarded as "means to effect the object of the act in respect of its revenue."

Opium is said to be an outlaw drug. One of the purposes of the act is to prohibit its importation: United States v. Brown, 224 Fed. Rep., 137. The act likewise prohibits its interstate transportation except under stringent regulations. Opium and its derivatives, in surgery and in medicine, have proven invaluable for the alleviation of pain, and are used to a greater extent, perhaps, than any other known drug possessing similar narcotic properties. The necessity for importation and the safeguarding its use and abuse is evidenced by a casual incursion into its history and uses. The act of 1909, as amended by the present act of December 17, 1914, indicates the settled policy of our Government to rigidly restrict the importation of opium into this country and to strictly guard its use and abuse. This brings home the truth of the statement that the act in question has a moral end as well as a revenue end. The responsibility is with the courts to see that those ends are reached through a revenue measure and within the limits of a revenue measure.

17

Do the two counts of the indictment state offenses against the laws of the United States? Applying the test prescribed by Justice Fuller: Is the sale by the defendant to Alexander Ameris of the inhibited drug, in the first count, "not in pursuance of the written order" required by the statute, to be regarded as a means to effect the object of the act in respect of its revenue? And, in the second count, is the sale by the defendant to Alexander Ameris of the inhibited drug "not in the regular course of his professional practice as a physician and not for the treatment of any disease from which a patient was then suffering, the said Ameris being a person addicted to the use of the inhibited drug, these facts being well known to the defendant," to be regarded as a means to effect the object of the act in respect of its revenue?

In testing the sufficiency of the demurrer, the allegations of the first and second counts are assumed to be true.

The main purpose of the act is to provide for a tax and enforce its collection for the legitimate sale or disposal of opium and its derivatives. Consequently, any regulation of law or provision that

18 aids in the enforcement of the collection of this tax is within the rights of Congress. In re Kollock, supra. The two counts show that the defendant was a physician who had duly registered and paid the special tax. It is not made to appear in what particular the requirement that a written order must be given by the purchaser to the seller renders effective the enforcement or collection of the tax, especially in this instance, where the tax is shown to have been paid by a person duly registered. It is clear, looking to the provision of the statute as to this requirement, that it has an important bearing as a police measure, in safeguarding the dispensing and distribution of the drug so that it may be limited in its use to persons actually in need of same as a medicine. A consideration of the whole act and of the many regulations of the Treasury Department governing the sale and control of the drug leads to the conclusion that greater efforts are made in the measure to protect against misuse of the drug than to its enforcement as a revenue act.

This reasoning applies more forcibly to the second count. There the regulation requiring the drug to be dispensed by a physician only in the course of professional practice, after having duly registered and paid the tax, can only be a police measure looking primarily to the protection of the public against the abuse of this drug, not remotely serving as an aid or means to effect the object of the act in respect of its revenue.

The offenses charged in the first and second counts of this indictment are stated in the very words of the statute, and as such prescribe regulations governing the sale, dispensing, and distribution of opium and its derivatives. Are those regulations to be considered as incidental or as means to enforce the collection of the revenue?

Nine years before the passage of this act the State of Texas, in the exercise of its reserved power of domestic regulation, passed certain laws, penal in character, which restricted and limited the sale and disposition of opium and its derivatives. Laws of Texas, acts

19 1905, pp. 45–46, R. S., 1911, Penal Code, Title 12, Chap V, arts. 747, 748, 749. The provisions of this regulatory act are in many particulars substantially the same as in this revenue bearing and taxation act. For instance: The State statutes require that the inhibited drugs may only be obtained (1) upon the original written order or prescription of a lawfully authorized practitioner of medicine * * * containing the date and name of the person for whom prescribed; (2) the original order must be permanently retained by the person, firm, or corporation authorized to sell or dispense the drug; (3) it is made unlawful for any practitioner of medicine to prescribe the drug for the use of an habitual user.

The enactment of local police laws regulating and restricting the use of opium and its derivatives, and their similarity with the provisions of the act of Congress, are conclusive of the State's purpose to exercise its power to regulate, and persuasive that the inclusion of the same provisions in a taxing measure by Congress was to

further the same moral ends that prompted the State in enacting them.

The national act provides for an annual tax of one dollar for each registered "dealer," and then so restricts and narrows the uses of the drug that no vital or important excess of revenue could reasonably be expected. The tax is nominal, yet the penalty for violating any provision of the act is so disproportionate to the gravamen of the offense (U. S. v. Woods, 224, Fed. Rep., 279), as to be further convincing that Congress was more concerned with the moral ends to be subserved than with the revenue to be derived.

The Supreme Court of the United States, in Mugler v. Kansas, 123 U. S., 623–661, referring to the so-called prohibition statute of Kansas, attacked in that case as unconstitutional as being in effect a confiscation of property under the pretense of protecting the public morals, health, and safety, says: "If, therefore, a statute purporting to have been enacted to protect the public health, the public morals, or the public safety, has no real or substantial relation to those objects, or is a palpable invasion of rights secured by the fundamental law, it is the duty of the courts to so adjudge, and thereby to give effect to the Constitution."

Applying this rule of construction, it would seem to be the court's duty to see that the real purpose of the act as a revenue measure should be carried into effect, but that those provisions of the act regulating and restricting traffic in the outlaw drug should be confined to their incidental functions "as means to effect the object of the act in respect of its revenue," and to that extent strictly construed.

It does not appear (1) that the sale of the drug by the defendant to a person not made in pursuance of that person's written order as required by the statute, as charged in the first count; and (2) that the sale by defendant "not in the regular course of professional practice," being to a "dope fiend," the fact being well-known to defendant, etc., as charged in the second count, tend to render effectual the collection of the revenue tax imposed by the act. On the contrary, the same substantial and similar provisions are embodied in the penal statutes of the State of Texas, which, in their enactment, exercised those sovereign police powers of domestic regulation conceded as its right. To extend the incidental moral objects of the taxing measure by a liberal construction would be to unfairly and without certain right encroach upon the State's sovereign powers. This should not be permitted, especially where doubt exists (as in this case) as to whether the questioned provisions of the law were means which reasonably tend to render effectual the enforcement of the law by the payment of the tax imposed. The rule of strict construction applies to criminal statutes such as this.

It is accordingly held that the indictment does not state an offense against the laws of the United States, in that the acts

of the defendant charged in the words of the statute to have been omitted and committed therein are police regulations and
21 incidental to the taxing purpose of the act, but which do not tend to render effectual its prime object—revenue. To that extent the act is in violation of Article X of the amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

The defendant's demurrer or motion to quash the indictment is sustained, and an order dismissing the indictment will be entered in due course.

In reaching the foregoing conclusions the questions involved have been given careful thought, and, in addition to the authorities cited, the following cases have been considered: Austin v. Tennessee, 179 U. S., 343; May v. New Orleans, 178 U. S., 496; U. S. v. Woods, 224 Fed. Rep., 278; U. S. v. Wilson, 225 Fed. Rep., 82; United States v. Jin Fuey Moy, 225 Fed. Rep., 1003; Tucker v. Williamson, 229 Fed. Rep., 344; United States v. Charter, 227 Fed. Rep., 331; United States v. Curtis, 229 Fed. Rep., 288; United States v. Friedman, 224 Fed. Rep., 276.

DUVAL WEST, *Judge.*

SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, *Jany. 2, 1918.*

(Endorsed:) No. 2254. The United States vs. Charles T. Doremus. Opinion. Filed January 2, 1918. D. H. Hart, clerk.

22 *Assignment of error.*

The United States District Court for the Western District of Texas, San Antonio Division.

THE UNITED STATES
vs.
DR. C. T. DOREMUS. } Law No. 2254.

TO THE HONORABLE DUVAL WEST, *Judge of said court:*

Comes now J. L. Camp, Esq., United States district attorney for the Western District of Texas, and on behalf of the United States of America files the following assignments of error in the hearing of the motion to quash the indictment in the above entitled and numbered cause, to wit:

First assignment of error.

The court erred in sustaining the defendant's motion to quash the indictment in said case on the ground "that the indictment does not state an offense against the laws of the United States in that the acts of the defendant charged in the words of the statute have been omitted and committed are police regulations and incidental to the taxing purposes of the act which do not tend to render effectual its prime object, revenue. To that extent the act is in violation of Article X of the amendments to the Constitution of the United States": because *cause* said indictment does charge an offense against

the laws of the United States, and the offense charged is not in violation of any provision of the Constitution of the United States.

J. L. CAMP,
United States Attorney for the Western District of Texas.

(Endorsed:) No. 2254. In the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas. The United States vs. C. T. Doremus. Assignment of error. Filed January 26th, 1918. D. H. Hart, clerk, by A. I. Campbell, deputy.

23 *Petition for writ of error.*

The United States District Court for the Western District of Texas.

THE UNITED STATES
vs.
C. T. DOREMUS. } Law No. 2254.

To the honorable DUVAL WEST, *judge of said court:*

Comes now the United States of America, by J. L. Camp, Esq., United States attorney in and for the Western District of Texas, and being aggrieved by the order of the court sustaining the motion to quash the indictment in the above-entitled and numbered cause, said order having been entered on the 2nd day of January, A. D. 1918, and petitions this honorable court for an order allowing the United States of America to prosecute a writ of error to the honorable Supreme Court of the United States, according to the laws of the United States in that behalf provided, for which you petitioner will ever pray.

J. L. CAMP,
United States Attorney for the Western District of Texas.

(Endorsed:) No. 2254. In the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas. The United States vs. Dr. C. T. Doremus. Petition for writ of error. Filed January 26th, 1918. D. H. Hart, clerk, by A. I. Campbell, deputy.

24 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *ss:*

The President of the United States to the honorable the judge of the United States District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas, greeting:

Because in the record and proceedings, as also in the rendition of the judgment of a plea which is in the said district court, before you, or some of you, between the United States of America, plaintiff in error, and C. T. Doremus, defendant in error, a manifest error hath happened, to the great damage of the said United States of America, plaintiff in error, as by their complaint appears. We being willing that error, if any hath been, should be duly corrected, and full and speedy justice done to the parties aforesaid in this behalf, to command you, if judgment be therein given, that then under your

seal, distinctly and openly, you send the record and proceedings aforesaid, with all things concerning the same, to the United States Supreme Court, together with this writ, so that you have the same at Washington, D. C., within thirty days from the date hereof, in the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, to be then and there held, and the record and proceedings aforesaid being inspected, the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals may cause further to be done therein to correct that error, what of right, and according to the laws and customs of the United States should be done.

Witness the honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice of the United States, the 26th day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and eighteen.

[SEAL.] D. H. HART,
Clerk of the United States District Court.

Allowed this the 26th day of January, A. D. 1918.

DUVAL WEST,
United States Judge.
By A. I. CAMPBELL,
Deputy U. S. Clerk.

25 THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Fifth Judicial Circuit.

The President of the United States to C. T. Doremus and Haltom & Haltom, his attorneys of record, greeting:

You are hereby cited and admonished to be and appear before the United States Supreme Court at Washington, D. C., within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to writ of error sued out and filed in the clerk's office of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas in the cause wherein the United States of America is plaintiff in error and C. T. Doremus is defendant in error, to show cause, if any there be, why the judgment rendered against the said United States of America, as in said writ of error mentioned, should not be corrected, and why speedy justice should not be done to the parties in that behalf.

Witness the Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice of the United States, this 26th day of January in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and eighteen.

Attest:

[SEAL.] D. H. HART,
U. S. Dist. Clerk,
By A. I. CAMPBELL,
Deputy.

Signed this, the 26th day of January, 1918.

DUVAL WEST,
United States Judge.

Service of this citation accepted this the 26th day of January, 1918.

HALTOM & HALTOM,
Attorneys for the Defendant In Error.

26 *Præcipe for transcript.*

The United States District Court.

For the Western District of Texas, San Antonio Division.

THE UNITED STATES
vs.
Dr. C. T. DOREMUS. } Law No. 2254.

PRÆCIPE FOR TRANSCRIPT.

To the Honorable D. H. Hart, clerk of the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas:

SIR: A writ of error having been allowed and ordered and in all things approved in accordance with law in the above entitled and numbered cause, comes now the United States of America by J. L. Camp, United States attorney for the Western Distirct of Texas, and makes application for and requests that the transcript of record in this case on said writ of error include the following papers and documents, to wit:

1. Caption.
2. Indictment.
3. Motion to quash the indictment.
4. Judgment of the court on the motion to quash the indictment.
5. Opinion of the court.
6. Assignment of error.
7. Petition for writ of error.
8.
9. Writ of error.
10. Citation in error and acceptance of service.
11.
12. Præcipe for transcript.

J. L. CAMP,
United States Attorney.

(Endorsed:) No. 2254. In the United States District Court of the United States. The United States vs. Dr. C. T. Doremus. Præcipe for transscript. Filed: January 26, 1918. D. H. Hart, clerk, by A. I. Campbell, deputy.

27 *Clerk's certificate.*

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Western District of Texas.

I, D. H. Hart, clerk of the District Court of the United States, in and for the Western District of Texas, do hereby certify that the foregoing on 26 pages from one to twenty-six, inclusive, is a true and correct transcript of proceedings had and orders entered, as therein

stated, in cause No. 2254 Criminal, The United States vs. C. T. Doremus, as the same appears on file and of record in this office, except that the original citation in error and writ of error are included at pages 24 and 25 herein, instead of copies thereof.

Witness my official signature and the seal of the District Court, at office in the city of San Antonio, Texas, this 7th day of February, A. D. 1918.

[SEAL.]

D. H. HAIT,
Clerk U. S. District Court.
By A. I. CAMPBELL,
Deputy U. S. Clerk.

28 (Endorsed on cover:) File No. 26344. W. Texas, D. C. U. S. Term No. 877. The United States of America, plaintiff in error, vs. C. T. Doremus. Filed February 19th, 1918. File No. 26344.

In the Supreme Court of the United States.

OCTOBER TERM, 1917.

THE UNITED STATES, PLAINTIFF IN ERROR,
v.
C. T. DOREMUS. } No. 877.

IN ERROR TO THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS.

W. S. WEBB AND JACOB GOLDBAUM,
v.
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. } No. 883.

ON A CERTIFICATE FROM THE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT.

MOTION BY THE UNITED STATES TO ADVANCE.

Comes now the Solicitor General and in accordance with the provisions of the Criminal Appeals Act, 34 Stat. 1246, moves to advance No. 877 for hearing on a day convenient to the court.

Because of the similarity of the propositions involved in No. 877 to those presented in No. 883, the Solicitor General also moves for the advancement of the latter case and requests that both cases be assigned for joint hearing.

In No. 877, plaintiff in error, a practicing physician who had been duly registered and paid the tax as required by the so-called "Harrison Antinarcotic Act," 38 Stat. 785, was indicted in the District

Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas, among other things—

1. For having sold a quantity of heroin to a certain person not in pursuance of a written order, in violation of section 2 of said act which provides *inter alia* that:

> It shall be unlawful for any person to sell, barter, exchange, or give away any of the aforesaid drugs *except in pursuance of a written order of the person to whom such article is sold, bartered, exchanged, or given, on a form to be issued in blank for that purpose by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.* [Italics mine.]

2. For having sold and dispensed to a certain person alleged to be an habitual drug fiend a quantity of heroin, not in the course of his professional practice nor for the treatment of any disease from which the said fiend was suffering but merely to gratify the latter's desire for the drug, in violation of paragraph (a) of section 2 of said act which provides *inter alia* that nothing contained in the section shall apply—

> To the dispensing or distribution of any of the aforesaid drugs to a patient by a physician * * * registered under this act *in the course of his professional practice only.* * * * [Italics mine.]

A demurrer to the indictment was sustained, the District Court holding that the acts of the plaintiff in error charged in the indictment in the words of the statute are matters of police regulation which do not tend to render effectual the prime object of the act—revenue—and which are reserved to the States, and

to the extent that the act prohibits the same, it is unconstitutional and in violation of the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution.

In No. 883, Webb and Goldbaum were convicted in the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Tennessee of a conspiracy to commit an offense against the United States, to wit, to violate the "Harrison Antinarcotic Act," in violation of section 37 of the Criminal Code. The facts may be succinctly stated as follows:

Webb was a practicing physician and Goldbaum a retail druggist. Both were duly registered and had paid the tax as required by the provisions of the act. It was Webb's custom to prescribe morphine to habitual users upon their application to him therefor. Goldbaum was familiar with this practice and constantly filled the prescriptions. Goldbaum was provided with the blank forms contemplated by section 2 of the act and by use thereof had obtained copious quantities of morphine from wholesale dealers. It was agreed and understood by Webb and Goldbaum that the latter should, by the use of these forms, procure a stock of morphine, which he should and would sell to those who desired to purchase and who came provided with Webb's so-called prescriptions. It was the intent of both that morphine should be thus furnished by Goldbaum to habitual users thereof, but without any physician's prescription issued in the course of a "good faith" attempt to cure the morphine habit.

A writ of error to the judgment of conviction was sued out from the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, which has certified to this court the following questions:

"1. Does the first sentence of section 2 of the Harrison Act prohibit retail sales of morphine by druggists to persons who have no physician's prescription, who have no order blank therefor and who can not obtain an order blank because not of the class to which such blanks are allowed to be issued?

"2. If the answer to question one is in the affirmative, does this construction make unconstitutional the prohibition of such sale?

"3. If a practicing and registered physician issues an order for morphine to an habitual user thereof, the order not being issued by him in the course of professional treatment in the attempted cure of the habit, but being used for the purpose of providing the user with morphine sufficient to keep him comfortable by maintaining his customary use, is such order a physician's prescription under exception (*b*) of section 2?"

These cases are of importance to the Government in the enforcement of the "Harrison Act" and for that reason an early determination thereof by this court is desirable.

Notice of this motion has been served on opposing counsel in both cases.

JOHN W. DAVIS,
Solicitor General.

APRIL, 1918.

INDEX.

	Page.
STATEMENT OF CASE	1
ANALYSIS AND MEANING OF STATUTE	3
(a) Abstract of statute	3
(b) Meaning of the statute	5
ARGUMENT	8
The constitutionality of the statute as so analyzed	8
(a) The authorities	8
(1) Certain general decisions on the use of the taxing power in connection with social or moral ends	9
(2) Special authorities on the means which may be employed in a taxing statute	16
(3) Application of these authorities and conclusion of argument as to the constitutionality of section 2	28
Recent decisions dealing with the constitutionality of the act	30
CONCLUSION	32

AUTHORITIES CITED.

American Sugar Refining Co. v. *Louisiana*, 179 U. S. 89	13
Baldwin v. *United States*, 238 Fed. 793	32
Billings v. *United States*, 232 U. S. 261	9
Blunt v. *United States*	30
Brushaber v. *United States*, 240 U. S. 1	11
Cook v. *Marshall County*, 196 U. S. 261	15

	Page.
Felsenheld v. *United States*, 186 U. S. 126	20
Foreman v. *United States*	32
Head Money Cases, 112 U. S. 580	11
Hughes v. *United States*	32
In re Kollock, 165 U. S. 526	11, 16
Knowlton v. *Moore*, 178 U. S. 41	11
License Tax Cases, 5 Wall. 462	9
Magoun v. *Bank*, 170 U. S. 283	11
McCray v. *United States*, 195 U. S. 27	12, 17
Mountain Timber Co. v. Washington, 243 U. S. 219	15
Nicol v. *Ames*, 173 U. S. 509	18
United States v. *De Witt*, 9 Wall. 41	26
United States v. *132 Packages*, 76 Fed. 362	24
United States v. *Calhoun*, 39 Fed. 604	14
United States v. *Jin Fuey Moy*, 241 U. S. 394	3, 15
United States v. *Rosenberg*, 251 Fed. 963	32
Veazie Bank v. *Fenno*, 8 Wall. 533	10

In the Supreme Court of the United States.

OCTOBER TERM, 1918.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF IN ERROR,
v.
C. T. DOREMUS. } No. 367.

IN ERROR TO THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS.

BRIEF ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.

This is an indictment for violating section 2 of the Harrison drug law (act of December 17, 1914, 38 Stat. 785, c. 1).

The indictment is in ten counts, the first two of which may be taken as typical. The first count states that the defendant, Doremus, a physician registered under the first section of the statute, sold a specified amount of the drug heroin, a derivative of opium, to one Alexander Ameris not in pursuance of a written order of Ameris to Doremus (as required by the first sentence of the second section of the statute) on an order form supplied by the Commissioner

of Internal Revenue; and the second count charges that the sale was not in the regular course of the professional practice of Doremus and not for the treatment of any disease from which Ameris was suffering (within exception a of section 2), but simply to gratify his appetite as an habitual user of the drug (R. 1, 2). The remaining eight counts charge similar transactions with other parties, involving sales of other proscribed drugs.

The defendant moved to quash the indictment (R. 7), and this motion was sustained (R. 9–16) upon the ground that the provisions of section 2 of the act of December 17, 1914, prohibiting the sale of the drugs in question except in pursuance of a written order from the purchaser upon an official order form issued by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, or in the case of a physician dispensing the drug, to a patient in the course of his professional practice only, were unconstitutional. The case was then brought here by the United States under the provisions of the criminal appeals act (34 Stat. 1246).

A reading of the indictment shows that the first two counts and each succeeding two counts must be read together in order to make out the offense intended to be charged. According to the decisions of this court, however, in a case of this character the meaning or sufficiency of the indictment is not in question. The District Court having decided the case solely upon the ground that the act was unconstitutional as to the provsions referred to, no other question is pending before this court.

ANALYSIS AND MEANING OF STATUTE.

(a) Abstract of statute.

The act in full is printed in an appendix to this brief. An abstract of it is given by this court in *United States* v. *Jin Fuey Moy*, 241 U. S. 394, 399, 400, but as that abstract was directed to the meaning of section 8, and not especially to that of section 2, the following additional summary of the act is submitted.

The act is entitled:

> An act to provide for the registration of, with collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or coca leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes.

Section 1 provides that persons doing the things mentioned in the title must register with the collector of internal revenue and must pay a special tax of $1 per annum. Exception is made of the employees of such persons and of Federal and State officers acting in their official capacity. It is made unlawful for any person to do the things mentioned in the title without having registered and paid the tax, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is given the usual power to make administrative regulations.

Section 2 is the important one for the purpose of the present case. It provides:

> That it shall be unlawful for any person to sell, barter, exchange, or give away any of the

> aforesaid drugs except in pursuance of a written order of the person to whom such article is sold, bartered, exchanged, or given on a form to be issued in blank for that purpose by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The transferer must preserve the order for inspection and the transferee preserve a duplicate for the same purpose. Four exceptions are made to this requirement of transfers on order forms only, but only the first two are material for the purpose of the present case.

(*a*) A physician may dispense or distribute the drugs directly without an order form, but this he can only do to a patient "in the course of his professional practice," and under the obligation to keep a record of the drugs so dealt in, except in the case of personal attendance on a patient.

(*b*) A druggist, or other ordinary dealer in the drugs, may sell them to a consumer without an order form, provided the consumer produces the written prescription of a physician registered under the act.

By the last paragraph of the section it is provided that the order forms, without which the drugs may not be transferred except through the intervention of a physician, can only be sold to persons who have registered and paid the special tax, and it is expressly provided that—

> It shall be unlawful for any person to obtain by means of said order forms any of the aforesaid drugs for any purpose other than the use, sale, or distribution thereof by him in

the conduct of a lawful business in said drugs or in the legitimate practice of his profession.[1]

(b) Meaning of the statute.

Looking at section 2 of the act, in connection with the title and all the other provisions thereof, it is clear that the key to its meaning is in the distinction made between producers of, and dealers in, these drugs, on the one hand, and consumers of them on the other. The former must register and pay the special tax; the latter not. The incidence of the tax is placed upon the former by the title of the act, and by its first section, while the latter are not directly dealt with by the act at all. This distinction is believed to be fundamental. Assuming it to be the practical object in the mind of Congress, the natural end to be accomplished by the act in this connection would be to see that the drugs in question, in so far as the incidence of the tax upon them was concerned, came really and honestly into the hands of consumers, and did not, through the passport of a drug-

[1] The remaining provisions of the act are not exactly germane to the present case, and can, therefore, be placed in a note. Section 3 requires a registered person to give a full report of the drugs received by him. Section 4 prohibits the interstate, or analogous transportation by persons not registered. Section 5 provides for the preservation of the order forms, prescriptions, and returns, and their publicity or nonpublicity under certain circumstances. In this respect the act follows the general internal-revenue system on this subject. Section 6 is a *de minimis* section. Section 7 has the usual provision in internal-revenue statutes as to the application of the general administrative internal-revenue laws. Section 8 was construed in *Jin Fuey Moy's case*, 241 U. S. 394. As so construed it relates only to producers, dealers, etc., and prohibits the possession by them of the drugs unless they have registered and paid the special tax. Section 9 fixes the penalty for violation of any of the previous requirements of the act. Sections 10, 11, and 12 do not require consideration.

gist or doctor, come into the hands of a dealer who would not register, would not pay the special tax, and whose dealings would not be supervised by the Bureau of Internal Revenue. For this reason the sale of the drugs without registration and payment of the special tax was prohibited by section 1, and even their possession by dealers without registration and payment of the tax was prohibited by section 8. For this same reason the transfer of the drugs, except through official order forms, was prohibited by section 2. The handling in commercial intercourse of drugs of this character presents an entirely new proposition to internal-revenue officers. The facility with which they may be transferred, owing to the small quantities sufficient for successful production of and dealing in them, and the ease therefore with which the tax upon dealers may be evaded are evident, and therefore methods and means, which seem at first drastic, may nevertheless be properly deemed by Congress necessary to secure the assessment of *all* producers and dealers, while relieving genuine consumers.

Congress, therefore, had a right, possibly a duty, in dealing with a drug which so easily escapes detection as morphine and cocaine to provide that dealers in it should work under order forms issued by a public official; and that their receipts of the drug and their transfer of it to others should be regulated so that the drugs might not be sold to persons claiming to be consumers, and, therefore, not subject to the tax, but in reality dealers, and therfore subject to the tax and the supervision.

Congress, consequently, provided for the producers and dealers in the provisions of sections 1 and 2. It required the transferror and the transferee both to register in the normal case, and to pay the tax, and to use official order forms in their dealings with each other, so as to secure that both should so register and pay the tax.

It recognized, however, consumers in paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) of section 2. It permitted the sale of the drugs to them either from a physician directly or from him indirectly through a prescription to a druggist. This is the normal way in which a bona fide consumer would procure the drugs and it is therefore the only way Congress was bound to recognize. In order, however, to prevent frauds on the revenue by the obtaining of the drugs under the guise of bona fide consumers by persons who in truth intended to deal in them without registering and paying the special tax, it required that physicians dispensing the drugs directly should do so only to "patients" treated in the course of professional practice, and that druggists should dispense the drugs only on "prescriptions" issued by a physician, and that neither of them should procure the drugs on order forms for any purpose other than the distribution of them to bona fide consumers—that is, genuine patients of a physician. These provisions gave sufficient legitimate opportunity to genuine consumers, although, like all revenue laws, working possibly inconvenience in individual cases. They likewise

prevent (and this was clearly their purpose) persons intending to deal in the drugs from procuring large supplies in the guise of pretended "patients" or on bogus "prescriptions," and confined such persons to the use of official order forms which they could not procure unless they registered and paid the special tax.

The act thus looked at hangs together. It is true, of course, that it also had the moral purpose of discouraging the use of the drugs except as a medicine, but its main purpose as a revenue measure to see that dealers in the drugs do not escape the tax (as dealers in such drugs have a great opportunity to do) is clearly evidenced by the provisions as to order forms with their only alternative of a genuine prescription to a bona fide patient. These provisions to prevent fraud on the revenue may be drastic, but it can not be said they are not effective from a revenue point of view.

ARGUMENT.

THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE ACT AS SO ANALYZED.

(a) The authorities.

It is believed no claim will be made that the general provisions of section 1 of the act levying an excise tax on producers of and dealers in certain drugs is unconstitutional, as it is in line with many other Federal excise taxes which have been sustained, e. g., those on wholesale and retail liquor dealers and on corporations doing business as such. The claim must be, therefore, that the special provisions of

section 2 which have been discussed above are so clearly and positively unrelated to the end of the collection of an excise tax as to constitute them beyond the legislative power of Congress. In order to determine whether this be true or not, a brief statement of certain decisions of this court upon analogous questions will be helpful as showing the attitude of this court toward the taxing power of Congress, and the presumptions which will be indulged in favor of the lawfulness of the means adapted by Congress to effectuate the exercise of that power.

(1) CERTAIN GENERAL DECISIONS ON THE USE OF THE TAXING POWER IN CONNECTION WITH SOCIAL OR MORAL ENDS.

The best-known example of the laying of taxes for other purposes than mere revenue is the protective tariff taxes whose constitutionality is now clearly established. Not only these taxes themselves, but also the means authorized for their assessment and collection were notoriously adopted largely for the purpose of encouraging the establishment and successful prosecution of certain industries. Under the same head might be put the tax on the use of foreign-built yachts, which was sustained in *Billings* v. *United States*, 232 U. S. 261.

In the *License Tax Cases*, 5 Wall. 462, a tax in the guise of a license was laid on the selling of lottery tickets, and the retail dealing in liquors. It was objected that such a license was an interference with the police powers of the several States. In

holding the act constitutional, this court said (5 Wall., p. 473):

> There is nothing hostile or contradictory, therefore, in the acts of Congress to the legislation of the States. What the latter prohibits, the former, if the business is found existing notwithstanding the prohibition, discourages by taxation. The two lines of legislation proceed in the same direction, and tend to the same result. It would be a judicial anomaly, as singular as indefensible, if we should hold a violation of the laws of the State to be a justification for the violation of the laws of the Union.

In *Veazie Bank* v. *Fenno*, 8 Wall. 533, a prohibitive and special tax was laid on the notes of State banks for the purpose (as was well known) of driving them out of circulation. In sustaining its constitutionality this court said (8 Wall. p. 548):

> It is insisted, however, that the tax in the case before us is so excessive as to indicate a purpose on the part of Congress to destroy the franchise of the bank, and is therefore beyond the constitutional power of Congress.
>
> The first answer to this is that the judicial can not prescribe to the legislative departments of the Government limitations upon the exercise of its acknowledged powers. The power to tax may be exercised oppressively upon persons, but the responsibility of the legislature is not to the courts, but to the people by whom its members are elected. So if a particular tax bears heavily upon a corpo-

> ration or a class of corporations, it can not, for that reason only, be pronounced contrary to the Constitution.

In the *Head Money Cases*, 112 U. S. 580, the act levying a duty upon shipowners bringing alien passengers to this country from foreign parts was sustained. Answering the objection that the levy was not uniform because it did not apply to aliens brought by rail, this court said (112 U. S. 595):

> * * * It may be added that the evil to be remedied by this legislation has no existence on our inland borders, and immigration in that quarter needed no such regulation. * * *

In *Magoun* v. *Bank*, 170 U. S. 283; *Knowlton* v. *Moore*, 178 U. S., 41; and *Brushaber* v. *United States*, 240 U. S., 1, taxes graduated according to the amount of income of the taxpayer were sustained against the objection that they were in reality intended to affect the natural distribution of wealth, this court saying in the latter case (240 U. S. p. 25):

> In this situation it is of course superfluous to say that arguments as to the expediency of laying such taxes or of economic mistake or wrong involved in their imposition are beyond judicial cognizance.

In *in re Kollock*, 165 U. S., 526, the act levying a special tax on dealers in oleomargarine was sustained, the court saying (165 U. S. 536):

> The act before us is on its face an act for levying taxes, and although it may operate in

> so doing to prevent deception in the sale of oleomargarine as and for butter, its primary object must be assumed to be the raising of revenue.

In *McCray* v. *United States*, 195 U. S. 27, the later act levying a higher tax on oleomargarine was sustained over a very strong showing that it was intended merely to suppress the production of and dealing in oleomargarine, and was therefore an interference with the reserved police powers of the States. The reason given by the court was as follows (195 U. S. 63, 64):

> * * * As we have said, it has been conclusively settled by this court that the tendency of that article to deceive the public into buying it for butter is such that the States may, in the exertion of their police powers, without violating the due process clause of the fourteenth amendment, absolutely prohibit the manufacture of the article. It hence results, that even although it be true that the effect of the tax in question is to repress the manufacture of artificially colored oleomargarine, it can not be said that such repression destroys rights which no free government could destroy, and, therefore, no ground exists to sustain the proposition that the judiciary may invoke an implied prohibition, upon the theory that to do so is essential to save such rights from destruction. And the same considerations dispose of the contention based upon the due process clause of the fifth amendment. That provision, as we have previously

> said, does not withdraw or expressly limit the grant of power to tax conferred upon Congress by the Constitution. From this it follows, as we have also previously declared, that the judiciary is without authority to avoid an act of Congress exerting the taxing power, even in a case where to the judicial mind it seems that Congress had in putting such power in motion abused its lawful authority by levying a tax which was unwise or oppressive, or the result of the enforcement of which might be to indirectly affect subjects not within the powers delegated to Congress.

It may be noted as to this case that under the act (as it would seem) oleomargarine, even if so labeled and hence not deceptive, would have to pay a much higher tax than adulterated butter.

Certain cases in this court sustaining State taxing laws seem also in point.

In *American Sugar Refining Co.* v. *Louisiana*, 179 U. S. 89, a statute levying a tax upon refiners of sugar but exempting planters and farmers was sustained, the court saying (179 U. S. 95):

> The discrimination is obviously intended as an encouragement to agriculture, and does not deny to persons and corporations engaged in a general refining business the equal protection of the laws.

On page 93 of the opinion in this case several instances are given where Congress in levying Federal taxes has exempted classes on the principle of the Louisiana statute. Of these examples the act of

July 1, 1862, 12 Stat., 432, seems especially applicable to the present case, in that it levied a tax on retail dealers in goods, but excepted "apothecaries, as to wines or spirituous liquors which they use exclusively in the preparation or making of medicines for lame, sick or diseased persons." In *United States* v. *Calhoun*, 39 Fed. 604, Judge Simonton in charging the jury in a case of violation of this act (now section 3246, R. S.) said:

> An apothecary who bona fide uses spirituous liquor exclusively in the preparation or making up of medicines need not pay the special tax. These are the questions you must answer in this case: In the sale made by defendant to witnesses for the Government, did he bona fide sell the compound to them as medicine, and not as a beverage, or was the compound simply whisky in disguise? Is it a medicine to cure disease, or is it intended to gratify his thirst for drink? * * *

This statute and charge are not directly in point because the former merely exempted certain dealers, and the question was whether the person involved was liable to the tax or was covered by the exemption, while in the present case both Webb and Goldbaum have paid the tax as dealers; but they show the right of Congress, in order to prevent frauds on the revenue, to distinguish between persons prescribing the article as a medicine and persons merely pretending to do so, thus in effect regulating the business of a druggist or a physician.

In *Cook* v. *Marshall County*, 196 U. S. 261, a law of the State of Iowa imposing a heavy tax on retailers of cigarettes but exempting jobbers and wholesalers doing an interstate business was sustained. The moral purpose of this legislation is obvious.

In *Mountain Timber Co.* v. *Washington*, 243 U. S. 219, an act levying a tax on all manufacturers within a certain class, to pay compensation to employees injured in any manufactory of that class was sustained, and on pages 244, 245 a number of instances and authorities are collected of taxes laid to correct a supposed social injustice.

Finally, in *United States* v. *Jin Fuey Moy*, 241 U. S. 394, 402, this court said of the act now under consideration:

> It may be assumed that the statute has a moral end as well as revenue in view, but we are of opinion that the district court, in treating those ends as to be reached only through a revenue measure and within the limits of a revenue measure, was right.

These cases (and many others which could be cited) demonstrate the strong reluctance of this court to declare a taxing act unconstitutional because it is claimed to interfere with the reserved powers of the States, or to have been enacted for other purposes than appear upon its face. If it be on its face a valid exercise of the taxing power, every reasonable presumption will be indulged in its favor. The mere fact that part of its purpose, or perhaps its main purpose, is to promote some

political, economic, social, or moral end is not sufficient to render it unconstitutional in the courts.

(2) SPECIAL AUTHORITIES ON THE MEANS WHICH MAY BE EMPLOYED IN A TAXING STATUTE.

Having thus observed the general attitude of this court toward taxing laws analogous to the act now under consideration, the next question is as to its attitude toward the means which Congress may constitutionally employ to reach its end (the decisive point in the case at bar in so far as question 2 is concerned).

In *in re Kollock*, 165 U. S. 526, the question was as to the validity of certain regulations covering the manner in which taxed oleomargarine should be packed and labeled. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue had provided by regulations as follows (165 U. S., p. 530, 531):

> * * * that the wooden or paper packages in which retail dealers in oleomargarine were required by said act of Congress to pack the oleomargarine sold by them, such retail dealers, should have printed or branded upon them in the case of each sale the name and address of the retail dealer making the same; likewise the words "pound" and "oleomargarine" in letters not less than one-quarter of an inch square, and likewise a figure or figures of the same size indicating (in connection with said words "pound" and "oleomargarine") the quantity of oleomargarine so sold, written, printed, or branded on such wooden or paper packages and placed before the said word "pound," and that the said words "oleo-

> margarine" and "pound" so required to be printed or branded on such packages as aforesaid in the case of each sale as aforesaid and the said figure or figures so indicative of quantity as aforesaid in the case of each sale as aforesaid and so required to be written, printed, or branded on such packages as aforesaid should be so placed thereon as to be plainly visible to the purchaser at the time of the delivery to him, such purchaser, by such retail dealers of the oleomargarine sold to such purchaser, by them, such retail dealers.

This court said as to these regulations (165 U. S. 536):

> And, *considered as a revenue act*, the designation of the stamps, marks, and brands is merely in the discharge of an administrative function and falls within the numerous instances of regulations needful to the operation of the machinery of particular laws, authority to make which has always been recognized as within the competency of the legislative power to confer.

The case of *McCray* v. *United States*, 195 U. S. 27, affirmed the constitutionality of the same act with a higher tax rate, and, while nothing was said as to the administrative measures adopted to carry out the revenue ends, the court, as pointed out above, approved expressly these administrative provisions as designed to prevent deception by the selling of oleomargarine for adulterated butter.

In *Nicol* v. *Ames*, 173 U. S. 509, an excise tax upon sales or agreements to sell at any exchange or board of

trade was held constitutional. The act, as stated by this court, as a basis for its decision, provided as follows (173 U. S. 513, 514):

> * * * *Provided*, That on every sale or agreement of sale or agreement to sell as aforesaid, there shall be made and delivered by the seller to the buyer a bill, memorandum, agreement, or other evidence of such sale, agreement of sale or agreement to sell, to which there shall be affixed a lawful stamp or stamps in value equal to the amount of the tax on such sale. And every such bill, memorandum or other evidence of sale or agreement to sell shall show the date thereof, the name of the seller, the amount of the sale, and the matter or thing to which it refers; and any person or persons liable to pay the tax as herein provided, or any one who acts in the matter as agent or broker for such person or persons, who shall make any such sale or agreement of sale, or agreement to sell, or who shall, in pursuance of any such sale, agreement of sale or agreement to sell, deliver any such products or merchandise without a bill, memorandum, or other evidence thereof, as herein required, or who shall deliver such bill, memorandum or other evidence of sale, or agreement to sell, without having the proper stamps affixed thereto, with intent to evade the foregoing provisions, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall pay a fine of not less than five hundred nor more than one thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not more than six months, or both, at the discretion of the court.

In regard to this provision of the act, this court said (173 U. S. 523, 524):

> * * * It provides for a written memorandum containing the matters mentioned, simply as a means of identifying the sale and for collecting the tax by means of the required stamp, and for that purpose it secured by proper penalties the making of the memorandum. Instead of a memorandum, Congress might have required a sworn report with the proper amount of stamps thereon to be made at certain regular intervals, of all sales made subject to the tax. Other means might have been resorted to for the same purpose. Whether the means adopted were the best and most convenient to accomplish that purpose was a question for the judgment of Congress, and its decision must be conclusive in that respect
>
> The means actually adopted do not illegally interfere with or obstruct the internal commerce of the States, nor are such means a restraint upon that commerce so far as to render the means adopted illegal. That Congress might have adopted some other means for collecting the tax which would prove less troublesome or annoying to the taxpayer, can surely be no reason for holding that the method set forth in the act renders the tax invalid. As it has the power to impose the tax, the means to be adopted for its collection within reasonable and rational limits must be a question for Congress alone.

In *Felsenheld* v. *United States*, 186 U. S. 126, a case was certified to this court singularly like the present.

The first question was whether the third clause of the tenth section of the act of July 24, 1897, was constitutional (186 U. S., p. 130). The certificate had a statement of facts as in the case at bar, in which it was stated (186 U. S. 127) that manufacturers of tobacco had fallen into the habit of inclosing in their packages prizes for the persons who bought them, and that the Internal Revenue Bureau had promulgated a regulation that the tax should be paid on the full weight of the package including the prizes. It was stated in these regulations that the practice of including prizes, coupons, etc., should be discontinued. Acting upon the idea formulated in these regulations, Congress passed the third clause of the tenth section of the tariff act of 1897 which provided that no packages of tobacco or cigarettes should have packed in them anything else than the manufacturers' wrappers and labels, the internal-revenue stamp, and the tobacco itself; and there was an additional provision as follows (186 U. S., p. 127):

> * * * nor shall there be affixed to, or branded, stamped, marked, written, or printed upon, said packages, or their contents, any promise or offer of, or any order or certificate for, any gift, prize, premium, payment, or reward.

The tobacco in question was forfeited because the owner of certain chewing and smoking tobacco inserted in the packages a small slip advertising his wares, and offering prizes to purchasers. The certificate stated (186 U. S. 129):

> This coupon is printed on thin paper, is of inappreciable weight, is without any intrinsic

> value in itself, and has upon it no picture of any kind, *and does not affect, in any way, the ascertaining of the proper tax payable upon the package or interfere in any way with the collection of such tax.*

Upon this statement of facts the question was directly presented to this court as to the constitutionality of this legislation, which, it was claimed, was directed, under the pretense of taxation, at the offering of prizes, coupons, etc., to the purchasers of tobacco. This court sustained the constitutionality of the act in the following language (186 U. S. 132, 133, 134):

> It seems to us that, in the rules and regulations for the manufacture and handling of goods which are subjected to an internal-revenue tax, Congress may prescribe any rule or regulation which is not in itself unreasonable; that it is a perfectly reasonable requirement that every package of such goods should contain nothing but the article which is taxed; that in order to make such a regulation constitutional it is not necessary that there be either expressly or by implication an exception of those articles or things which by virtue of their minute size or weight do not apparently affect the collection of the tax. Congress may rightfully make the prohibition absolute and the courts may not draw a line between the foreign substance, which is trifling in size or weight, and that which is of appreciable size and weight, and hold, in reference to a particular package, the act valid if the size or weight is appreciable and invalid if it is not.

Among the regulations prescribed by Congress in its internal-revenue legislation are many which are purely arbitrary, or at least the necessity of which for the collection of taxes is not apparent. For instance, Congress has directed (Rev. Stat. 3392) that cigars shall be put up in boxes containing twenty-five, fifty, one hundred, two hundred and fifty, or five hundred each. There is no special efficacy in either of these numbers. Boxes containing fifteen, thirty, or sixty cigars would apparently afford just the same facilities for taxation, and yet can there be a doubt that Congress may make such a rule and compel each manufacturer to abide thereby? It has a right to select, and when it has made a selection, although there may be no special reasons for the specific numbers, and they are in fact arbitrarily selected, it may for purposes of uniformity compel compliance with the rule. So, if it should prescribe that at least nine-tenths of every package, purporting to be a package of a particular kind of tobacco, and subject to a special tax, should be that particular kind of tobacco, would the manufacturer be permitted to make one-third of the contents of some other kind of tobacco or any other substance? The proportion might be arbitrarily selected, it is true, but it is not clearly within the power of Congress in its regulations to make such arbitrary selection? And if it may say that not less than nine-tenths of the contents shall be that particular tobacco, the subject of the tax, is it any the less within the power of Congress to prescribe that there shall be nothing in the package save that tobacco?

> Indeed, the admission that the Government may require that the contents of a package shall be partly of the goods which it taxes is a concession that it may also require the entire contents to be such goods.
>
> There is in this statute no trespass upon the manufacturer's right to fully advertise his goods or to offer with the utmost freedom inducements for their purchase. He can put into the box in which he ships his packages all the advertising material he sees fit. That which is required is that each separate package shall be in its entirety a package of tobacco, and only tobacco. Beyond that the manner in which he shall sell, or the advertisement he shall make of his tobacco after the tax has been paid, and the packages have been stamped, is a matter for him to determine.
>
> We are of opinion that it is within the power of Congress to prescribe that a package of any article which it subjects to a tax, and upon which it requires the affixing of a stamp, shall contain only the article which is subject to the tax.

In *United States* v. *132 Packages*, 76 Fed. 362, the Court of Appeals of the Eighth Circuit (Judges Caldwell and Sanborn) held constitutional the following provision of section 3449, R. S.:

> Whenever any person ships, transports, or removes any spirituous or fermented liquors or wines, under any other than the proper name or brand known to the trade as designating the kind and quality of the contents of the casks or packages containing the same, or causes such an act to be done, he shall forfeit such liquors

or wines, and casks or packages, and be subject to pay a fine of five hundred dollars.

The court said (76 Fed. 367, 368):

> * * * The contention of the learned counsel for the claimant that the section is nothing but a trade-mark regulation is not tenable. It is one of the numerous regulations prescribed by the internal revenue laws intended to prevent frauds on the revenue in the manufacture, removal, shipment, and sale of distilled spirits and other liquors and to aid in the detection of such frauds. The regulations for this purpose are very extensive and extremely minute. They embrace every step in connection with the manufacture and handling of spirits, from the introduction of the raw material into the distillery down to the rectification of the product, and its removal, shipment, and sale. The court can not say that section 3449 does not conduce in any degree to prevent frauds on the revenue, or aid in their discovery and punishment. Unquestionably, an observance of the requirement that packages of liquor shall be shipped or removed only under names indicating truthfully their contents will aid the revenue officers to trace and identify such packages, and thereby verify the truth or falsity of the books and records of the distiller or rectifier. There are doubtless other ways familiar to the revenue officers in which the requirement of section 3449 tends to the detection and suppression of frauds on the revenue. Before a court would be authorized to hold an act of Congress obsolete and inoperative, it would have to appear conclusively that it was

> totally inoperative for any lawful or useful purpose. When the statute relates to a subject matter within the constitutional competency of Congress to legislate upon, the presumption is that it serves a useful purpose. When a statute is susceptible of two constructions, one of which would render it valid and operative and the other press it beyond the constitutional competency of Congress to enact, or render it inoperative, the former construction will be adopted. The section is none the less a revenue regulation because its enforcement may tend to discourage the piracy of trade-marks, and prevent frauds upon those who consume the contents of the packages. These are mere incidents of the statute, and not its primary object. Congress has an undoubted right to legislate to prevent frauds on the public revenue, and the validity of such legislation is not affected by the fact that it incidentally tends to the discovery or suppression of private frauds.

There is nothing in *United States* v. *Dewitt*, 9 Wall. 41, cited by this court in *Jin Fuey Moy's Case*, 241 U. S. 394, at page 401, opposed to the above decisions because in Dewitt's case no tax at all was levied upon the articles in question, and therefore this court said (9 Wall. 44):

> * * * And we have been referred to provisions, supposed to be analogous, regulating the business of distilling liquors, and the mode of packing various manufactured articles; but the analogy appears to fail at the essential

> point, for the regulations referred to are restricted to the very articles which are the subject of taxation, and are plainly adapted to secure the collection of the tax imposed; while, in the case before us, no tax is imposed on the oils the sale of which is prohibited. If the prohibition, therefore, has any relation to taxation at all, it is merely that of increasing the production and sale of other oils, and, consequently, the revenue derived from them, by excluding from the market the particular kind described.

These decisions demonstrate that the same presumption prevails in favor of the constitutionality of the means adopted by Congress to effectuate its exercise of the taxing power as prevails regarding the exercise of the power itself. It is not simply that this court does not claim the power to decide whether the means and methods adopted by Congress are wise and well advised or not. The rule goes much further than this. This court recognizes that where Congress has acted clearly in the exercise of its taxing power (as in the case of the act now under consideration), the means employed to effectuate this legitimate functioning are in their nature practical, belonging to the field of experiment and experience, and outside of the field of judicial knowledge. Hence, if it once be determined that the main provision of the act levying the tax and defining its incidence is constitutional (as it is undoubtedly in the act now under consideration), the means devised by Congress for the

collection of the tax and the prevention of frauds in connection with it will, except in the most extraordinary case, be held to be within the proper scope of the legislative power. Indeed, as this court has said, the very nature of the legislative power implies the power to select the means, methods, and agents by and through which the main powers conferred on the legislature by the Constitution may be carried into effect. This is not to say that this court will not consider a claim that the means employed by Congress to carry out its legitimate ends are in themselves unconstitutional. It is, however, to say that every presumption is against such a claim, and that if, by any reasonably fair intendment, the means can possibly be brought into connection with the main end of taxation, they will be sustained, and that no suspicion, however strongly supported, that these means were in fact designed for political, social, or moral ends, is sufficient to overcome the presumption. The burden is upon the objector (in this case the defendants), and he is bound to show, e. g., in the case at bar, that under no possible circumstances existing in the drug traffic among human beings at the present day, can such provisions as are contained in the act now under consideration relating to the use of order forms and physicians' prescriptions have any possible bearing on the collection of taxes constitutionally levied upon the producers of, and dealers in, these drugs.

(3) APPLICATION OF THESE AUTHORITIES, AND CONCLUSION OF ARGUMENT AS TO THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF SECTION 2.

We have now abstracted and analyzed the statute in question, and have given our interpretation of its meaning; we have cited and quoted from authorities dealing with the exercise of the taxing power by Congress in cases analogous to this, and especially in cases dealing with the means, methods, and agents created by Congress to carry out its great taxing power. It only remains to apply the law declared by this court to the act now under consideration as above abstracted, analyzed, and interpreted. The minute the problem is approached in this way it is evident that the Government does not need the full benefit of the presumption which it is entitled to under the decisions in in re Kollock, *supra*, *Nicol* v. *Ames*, *supra*, and *Felsenheld* v. *United States*, *supra*. We insist that sections 1 and 2 of the act plainly, by their explicit terms, when carefully examined, show an intention of Congress to distinguish between consumers and dealers, for the purpose of revenue merely; that the provisions as to official order forms and physicians' prescriptions have a clear and direct connection with the prevention of frauds on the revenue in that they are aimed to prevent the obtaining of the drugs by dealers who do not intend to register and pay the tax, under the guise of genuine consumers, i. e., patients or drug addicts. The necessity and wisdom of these provisions as a prevention of frauds upon the revenue is recognizable

when there is borne in mind the present enormous traffic in these drugs and the well-known tendency of the illicit dealer in them as well as the habitual user to cover with every possible secrecy as far as possible both their sale and use.

From statistics and data obtained by special narcotic committee concerning this narcotic drug addiction it is conservatively estimated that there were treated or prescribed for during the year 1917 a total of 750,000 addicts of all ages and sexes. The fact that 214,941, or 80 per cent of the total number of 270,662 under treatment, reported from the entire United States were reported from the two States having compulsory registration furnishes a basis for approximating the total number of addicts in the country. Reports from an agricultural State in which registration is compulsory show that the addicts represent 0.7 of the population, while similar data obtained from an industrial State show the percentage of addicts to be 2.1. From this it may be estimated that there are 1,500,000 drug addicts in the United States, or 1.4 per cent of the total population. Congress, no doubt, having facts somewhat similar to these before it, in its wisdom saw fit to adopt the method it did in this law for the imposition of the tax and the assurance of its payment. "Whether the means adopted were the best and most convenient to accomplish that purpose was a question for the judgment of Congress, and its judgment must be conclusive in that respect."

RECENT DECISIONS DEALING WITH THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE ACT.

In the case of *Blunt* v. *United States*, decided by the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit the indictment charged a violation of the next to the last paragraph of section 2 of the act, in that the defendant, a physician, had obtained, by means of the official order forms, certain drugs for a purpose other than the use of distribution of them in the legitimate practice of his profession. The Court of Appeals held that the provisions of section 2 referred to above were unconstitutional. The reason for the decision was stated by the court as follows:

> It does not, however, follow from any of these cases or from the principles underlying them, that because Congress may tax any article regardless of whether or not it be a legitimate article of interstate commerce, it may enact an intrastate prohibition law as to any such article. Its power under article 8, clause 1, of the Constitution, is only to pay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; not to regulate taxation throughout the land. And while a power to regulate interstate commerce may include the right to prohibit such interstate commerce as may be deemed harmful, *Lottery Case*, 188 U. S. 321, Hoke case, *supra* (but see *Hammer* v. *Dagenhart*, June 3, 1918), the power to pay taxes on an article includes no right to make any specific use of such tax paid article unlawful.

> This, however, is the sole purpose and intent of the last clause in section 2. No question of tax or revenue or the protection or security thereof is involved; under this clause, it is declared unlawful for a physician who has paid the required license fee and has bought the order form essential to obtaining the drug to consume it himself as a drug addict or to give it away or to sell it except in the legitimate exercise of his profession. In our judgment, this prohibition has no relation whatsoever to the taxing power of Congress; it is exclusively an attempt, in the guise of an incidental tax regulation, to exercise the police powers reserved to the States.

The Court of Appeals in the Blunt case, however, sustained one of the counts in the indictment similar to the counts involved in the case at bar, namely, a count charging a sale of the drugs not upon the official order forms, so that the decision of the Court of Appeals of the Seventh Circuit is favorable to the Government in so far as the precise point raised in the present case is concerned. The Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit also held the act constitutional as to that portion involved in the present case in *Baldwin* v. *United States*, 238 Fed. 793, and a petition for a writ of certiorari was denied by this court on November 12, 1917, No. 725, October term, 1917. In addition, the constitutionality of the act, in so far as the provisions of subsection A of section 2 are concerned was sustained by Judge Learned Hand in the case of *United States* v. *Rosenberg*, 251 Fed. 963, the

court proceeding upon the principles stated in this brief.

It has also been upheld, as to its constitutionality, by the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Fourth Circuit in an opinion rendered December 5, 1918, in the case of *Walter F. Foreman* v. *The United States of America*, and by the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Eighth Circuit in *Hughes* v. *United States*, decided October 28 last.

In this latter opinion the Court of Appeals, speaking by Judge Hook, used the following language:

> It is urged that the purpose of the statute was the suppression of the drug habit and that it is therefore not a revenue measure but one of police within the exclusive province of the States. But we think it can not be said that the provisions referred to have no real or substantial relation to the raising of revenue. If they have such relation we have nothing to do with any other purpose of Congress. The traffic in such drugs is of a peculiar character. Considerable of it is carried on covertly by peddlers, and the small bulk of the articles facilitates clandestine distribution. The difficulties of subjecting the traffic to excise and preventing frauds on the revenue are obvious, and it was competent for Congress to bring the traffic into the open. That there may be consumers of the drugs who can not or will not obtain them in the ways provided is not enough to condemn the statute. Substantially the same result might have followed a heavy tax on such transactions, as to which

there would be no color for claim of unconstitutionality. In a case involving another provision this same statute was held to be a revenue measure. *United States* v. *Jin Fuey Moy*, 241 U. S. 394; 225 Fed. 1003.

CONCLUSION.

The judgment of the court below should be reversed.

CLAUDE R. PORTER,
Assistant Attorney General.
W. C. HERRON,
Attorney.

DECEMBER, 1918.

○

UNITED STATES *v.* DOREMUS.

ERROR TO THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS.

No. 367. Submitted January 16, 1919.—Decided March 3, 1919.

While Congress may not exert authority which is wholly reserved to the States, the power conferred by the Constitution to levy excise taxes, uniform throughout the United States, is to be exercised at the discretion of Congress; and, where the provisions of the law enacted have some reasonable relation to this power, the fact that they may have been impelled by a motive, or may accomplish a purpose, other than the raising of revenue, cannot invalidate them; nor can the fact that they affect the conduct of a business which is subject to regulation by the state police power. P. 93.

The Narcotic Drug Act of December 17, 1914, c. 1, 38 Stat. 785, § 1, requires those who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute or give away opium or coca leaves, or their compounds, derivatives, etc., to register and pay a special tax. Section 2 makes sales, etc., of these drugs unlawful except to persons who give orders on forms issued by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, which orders must be preserved for official inspection; forbids any person to obtain the drugs by means of such order forms for any purpose other than the use, sale or distribution thereof by him in the conduct of a lawful business therein, or the legitimate practice of his profession; but declares that it does not apply (a) to the dispensing or distributing of the drugs to patients by physicians registered under the act, in the course of professional practice only, provided the physicians keep certain records for official inspection, or (b) to sales, etc., by dealers upon prescriptions issued by registered physicians, provided the dealers preserve the prescriptions for like inspection. *Held*, that the provisions of § 2 have a reasonable relation to the enforcement of the tax provided by § 1 (which is clearly unobjectionable), and do not exceed the power of Congress. P. 94.

246 Fed. Rep. 958, reversed.

THE case is stated in the opinion.

Mr. Assistant Attorney General Porter and *Mr. W. C. Herron* for the United States:

A reading of the indictment shows that the first two counts and each succeeding two counts must be read together in order to make out the offense intended to be charged.

Looking at § 2 of the act, in connection with the title and all the other provisions thereof, it is clear that the key to its meaning is in the distinction made between producers of, and dealers in, these drugs, on the one hand, and consumers of them on the other. The former must register and pay the special tax; the latter not. The incidence of the tax is placed upon the former by the title of the act, and by its first section, while the latter are not directly dealt with by the act at all. This distinction is believed to be fundamental. Assuming it to be the practical object in the mind of Congress, the natural end to be accomplished by the act in this connection would be to see that the drugs in question, in so far as the incidence of the tax upon them was concerned, came really and honestly into the hands of consumers, and did not, through the passport of a druggist or doctor, come into the hands of a dealer who would not register, would not pay the special tax, and whose dealings would not be supervised by the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The facility with which they may be transferred, and the ease therefore with which the tax upon dealers may be evaded are evident, and therefore methods and means, which seem at first drastic, may nevertheless be properly deemed by Congress necessary to secure the assessment of all producers and dealers, while relieving genuine consumers.

Congress, consequently, provided for the producers and dealers in the provisions of §§ 1 and 2. It required the transferrer and the transferee both to register in the normal case, and to pay the tax, and to use official order forms in their dealings with each other, so as to secure that both should so register and pay the tax.

It recognized, however, consumers in paragraphs (*a*)

and (*b*) of § 2. It permitted the sale of the drugs to them either from a physician directly or from him indirectly through a prescription to a druggist. In order, however, to prevent frauds on the revenue by the obtaining of the drugs under the guise of *bona fide* consumers by persons who in truth intended to deal in them without registering and paying the special tax, it required that physicians dispensing the drugs directly should do so only to "patients" treated in the course of professional practice, and that druggists should dispense the drugs only on "prescriptions" issued by physicians, and that neither of them should procure the drugs on order forms for any purpose other than the distribution of them to *bona fide* consumers—that is, genuine patients of a physician. The act thus looked at hangs together. It is true, of course, that it also had the moral purpose of discouraging the use of the drugs except as a medicine, but its main purpose as a revenue measure was to see that dealers in the drugs do not escape the tax.

Counsel then instanced, as well-known examples of the use of the taxing power in connection with social or moral ends, the protective tariff system; the tax on foreign-built yachts, *Billings* v. *United States*, 232 U. S. 261; on dealers in liquors and lottery tickets, *License Tax Cases*, 5 Wall. 462; on notes of state banks, *Veazie Bank* v. *Fenno*, 8 Wall. 533; on importation of alien passengers, *Head Money Cases*, 112 U. S. 580; graduation of taxes, *Magoun* v. *Bank*, 170 U. S. 283; *Knowlton* v. *Moore*, 178 U. S. 41; *Brushaber* v. *United States*, 240 U. S. 1; on oleomargarine, *In re Kollock*, 165 U. S. 526; *McCray* v. *United States*, 195 U. S. 27; on sugar refiners, *American Sugar Refining Co.* v. *Louisiana*, 179 U. S. 89. On the right to exempt certain classes of dealers, *United States* v. *Calhoun*, 39 Fed. Rep. 604; *Cook* v. *Marshall County*, 196 U. S. 261. And see *Mountain Timber Co.* v. *Washington*, 243 U. S. 219; *United States* v. *Jin Fuey Moy*, 241 U. S. 394.

The same presumption prevails in favor of the constitutionality of the means adopted by Congress to effectuate its exercise of the taxing power as prevails regarding the exercise of the power itself. Where Congress has acted clearly in the exercise of its taxing power, the means employed to effectuate this legitimate functioning are in their nature practical, belonging to the field of experiment and experience, and outside of the field of judicial knowledge. Hence, if it once be determined that the main provision of the act levying the tax and defining its incidence is constitutional, the means devised by Congress for the collection of the tax and the prevention of frauds in connection with it will, except in the most extraordinary case, be held to be within the proper scope of the legislative power. *In re Kollock, supra; McCray* v. *United States, supra; Nicol* v. *Ames*, 173 U. S. 509; *Felsenheld* v. *United States*, 186 U. S. 126; *United States* v. *132 Packages*, 76 Fed. Rep. 362; *United States* v. *Dewitt*, 9 Wall. 41; *United States* v. *Jin Fuey Moy, supra.* Counsel also cited *Blunt* v. *United States*, 255 Fed. Rep. 332; *Baldwin* v. *United States*, 238 Fed. Rep. 793; *United States* v. *Rosenberg*, 251 Fed. Rep. 963; *Foreman* v. *United States*, 255 Fed. Rep. 621; and *Hughes* v. *United States*, 253 Fed. Rep. 543, dealing with the act of Congress in question.

No appearance for defendant in error.

MR. JUSTICE DAY delivered the opinion of the court.

Doremus was indicted for violating § 2 of the so-called Harrison Narcotic Drug Act. 38 Stat. 785; 6 U. S. Comp. Stats. 1916, § 6287g. Upon demurrer to the indictment the District Court held the section unconstitutional for the reason that it was not a revenue measure, and was an invasion of the police power reserved to the States. 246 Fed. Rep. 958. The case is here under the Criminal Appeals Act, 34 Stat. 1246.

There are ten counts in the indictment. The first two were treated by the court below as sufficient to raise the constitutional question decided. The first count in substance charges that: Doremus, a physician, duly registered, and who had paid the tax required by the first section of the act, did unlawfully, fraudulently, and knowingly sell and give away and distribute to one Ameris a certain quantity of heroin, to wit, five hundred one-sixth grain tablets of heroin, a derivative of opium, the sale not being in pursance of a written order on a form issued on the blank furnished for that purpose by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The second count charges in substance that: Doremus did unlawfully and knowingly sell, dispense and distribute to one Ameris five hundred one-sixth grain tablets of heroin not in the course of the regular professional practice of Doremus, and not for the treatment of any disease from which Ameris was suffering, but as was well known by Doremus, Ameris was addicted to the use of the drug as a habit, being a person popularly known as a "dope fiend," and that Doremus did sell, dispense, and distribute the drug, heroin, to Ameris for the purpose of gratifying his appetite for the drug as an habitual user thereof.

Section 1 of the act requires persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or coca leaves or any compound, manufacture, salt, derivative or preparation thereof, to register with the collector of internal revenue of the district his name or style, place of business, and place or places where such business is to be carried on. At the time of such registry every person who produces, imports, manufactures, compounds, deals in, dispenses, sells, distributes, or gives away any of the said drugs, is required to pay to the collector a special tax of $1.00 per annum. It is made unlawful for any person required to register

under the terms of the act to produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away any of the said drugs without having registered and paid the special tax provided in the act.

Section 2 provides in part:

"It shall be unlawful for any person to sell, barter, exchange, or give away any of the aforesaid drugs except in pursuance of a written order of the person to whom such article is sold, bartered, exchanged, or given, on a form to be issued in blank for that purpose by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Every person who shall accept any such order, and in pursuance thereof shall sell, barter, exchange, or give away any of the aforesaid drugs, shall preserve such order for a period of two years in such a way as to be readily accessible to inspection by any officer, agent, or employee of the Treasury Department duly authorized for that purpose, and the State, Territorial, District, municipal, and insular officials named in section five of this Act. Every person who shall give an order as herein provided to any other person for any of the aforesaid drugs shall, at or before the time of giving such order, make or cause to be made a duplicate thereof on a form to be issued in blank for that purpose by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and in case of the acceptance of such order, shall preserve such duplicate for said period of two years in such a way as to be readily accessible to inspection by the officers, agents, employees, and officials hereinbefore mentioned. Nothing contained in this section shall apply—

"(a) To the dispensing or distribution of any of the aforesaid drugs to a patient by a physician, dentist, or veterinary surgeon registered under this Act in the course of his professional practice only: *Provided*, That such physician, dentist, or veterinary surgeon shall keep a record of all such drugs dispensed or distributed, showing the amount dispensed or distributed, the date, and the

name and address of the patient to whom such drugs are dispensed or distributed, except such as may be dispensed or distributed to a patient upon whom such physician, dentist or veterinary surgeon shall personally attend; and such record shall be kept for a period of two years from the date of dispensing or distributing such drugs, subject to inspection, as provided in this Act.

"(b) To the sale, dispensing, or distribution of any of the aforesaid drugs by a dealer to a consumer under and in pursuance of a written prescription issued by a physician, dentist, or veterinary surgeon registered under this Act: *Provided, however,* That such prescription shall be dated as of the day on which signed and shall be signed by the physician, dentist, or veterinary surgeon who shall have issued the same: *And provided further,* That such dealer shall preserve such prescription for a period of two years from the day on which such prescription is filled in such a way as to be readily accessible to inspection by the officers, agents, employees, and officials hereinbefore mentioned."

It is made unlawful for any person to obtain the drugs by means of the order forms for any purpose other than the use, sale or distribution thereof by him in the conduct of a lawful business in said drugs, or the legitimate practice of his profession.

It is apparent that the section makes sales of these drugs unlawful except to persons who have the order forms issued by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and the order is required to be preserved for two years in such way as to be readily accessible to official inspection. But it is not to apply (a) to physicians, etc., dispensing and distributing the drug to patients in the course of professional practice, the physician to keep a record thereof, except in the case of personal attendance upon a patient; and (b) to the sale, dispensing, or distributing of the drugs by a dealer upon a prescription issued by a physician, etc.,

registered under the act. Other exceptions follow which are unnecessary to the consideration of this case.

Section 9 inflicts a fine or imprisonment, or both, for violations of the act.

This statute purports to be passed under the authority of the Constitution, Article I, § 8, which gives the Congress power "To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

The only limitation upon the power of Congress to levy excise taxes of the character now under consideration is geographical uniformity throughout the United States. This court has often declared it cannot add others. Subject to such limitation Congress may select the subjects of taxation, and may exercise the power conferred at its discretion. *License Tax Cases*, 5 Wall. 462, 471. Of course Congress may not in the exercise of federal power exert authority wholly reserved to the States. Many decisions of this court have so declared. And from an early day the court has held that the fact that other motives may impel the exercise of federal taxing power does not authorize the courts to inquire into that subject. If the legislation enacted has some reasonable relation to the exercise of the taxing authority conferred by the Constitution, it cannot be invalidated because of the supposed motives which induced it. *Veazie Bank* v. *Fenno*, 8 Wall. 533, 541, in which case this court sustained a tax on a state bank issue of circulating notes. *McCray* v. *United States*, 195 U. S. 27, where the power was thoroughly considered, and an act levying a special tax upon oleomargarine artificially colored was sustained. And see *Flint* v. *Stone Tracy Co.*, 220 U. S. 107, 147, 153, 156, and cases cited.

Nor is it sufficient to invalidate the taxing authority

given to the Congress by the Constitution that the same business may be regulated by the police power of the State. *License Tax Cases*, 5 Wall., *supra*.

The act may not be declared unconstitutional because its effect may be to accomplish another purpose as well as the raising of revenue. If the legislation is within the taxing authority of Congress—that is sufficient to sustain it. *In re Kollock*, 165 U. S. 526, 536.

The legislation under consideration was before us in a case concerning § 8 of the act, and in the course of the decision we said: "It may be assumed that the statute has a moral end as well as revenue in view, but we are of opinion that the District Court, in treating those ends as to be reached only through a revenue measure and within the limits of a revenue measure, was right." *United States* v. *Jin Fuey Moy*, 241 U. S. 394, 402. Considering the full power of Congress over excise taxation the decisive question here is: Have the provisions in question any relation to the raising of revenue? That Congress might levy an excise tax upon such dealers, and others who are named in § 1 of the act, cannot be successfully disputed. The provisions of § 2, to which we have referred, aim to confine sales to registered dealers and to those dispensing the drugs as physicians, and to those who come to dealers with legitimate prescriptions of physicians. Congress, with full power over the subject, short of arbitrary and unreasonable action which is not to be assumed, inserted these provisions in an act specifically providing for the raising of revenue. Considered of themselves, we think they tend to keep the traffic aboveboard and subject to inspection by those authorized to collect the revenue. They tend to diminish the opportunity of unauthorized persons to obtain the drugs and sell them clandestinely without paying the tax imposed by the federal law. This case well illustrates the possibility which may have induced Congress to insert

the provisions limiting sales to registered dealers and requiring patients to obtain these drugs as a medicine from physicians or upon regular prescriptions. Ameris, being as the indictment charges an addict, may not have used this great number of doses for himself. He might sell some to others without paying the tax, at least Congress may have deemed it wise to prevent such possible dealings because of their effect upon the collection of the revenue.

We cannot agree with the contention that the provisions of § 2, controlling the disposition of these drugs in the ways described, can have nothing to do with facilitating the collection of the revenue, as we should be obliged to do if we were to declare this act beyond the power of Congress acting under its constitutional authority to impose excise taxes. It follows that the judgment of the District Court must be reversed.

Reversed.

THE CHIEF JUSTICE dissents because he is of opinion that the court below correctly held the act of Congress, in so far as it embraced the matters complained of, to be beyond the constitutional power of Congress to enact because to such extent the statute was a mere attempt by Congress to exert a power not delegated, that is, the reserved police power of the States.

MR. JUSTICE MCKENNA, MR. JUSTICE VAN DEVANTER and MR. JUSTICE MCREYNOLDS concur in this dissent.